



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,988	06/25/2003	Anthony J. Wasilewski	A9286	5349
63658	7590	11/10/2009		
MERCHANT & GOULD SCIENTIFIC ATLANTA, A CISCO COMPANY P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
EXAMINER				
CHAI, LONGBIT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2431				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/10/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/602,988  
Filing Date: June 25, 2003  
Appellant(s): WASILEWSKI ET AL.

---

David Rodack  
Reg. No. 47,034  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 3 August 2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 1 April 2009.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The co-pending applications **10/602,986** and **10/602,987** are the related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which may directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

- (a) Candelore et al. (U.S. Patent 7,376,233) – *with incorporated by reference* of Unger et al. (U.S. Patent 2003/0026423) and
- (b) Vantalón et al. (U.S. Patent 7,216,358).

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1 – 12 and 15 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Candelore et al.** (U.S. Patent 7,376,233) – *with incorporated by reference* of **Unger et al.** (U.S. Patent 2003/0026423).

As per claim **1, 7 and 15**, Candelore teaches a method for providing a program in a conditional access system, the method comprising the steps of:

**selecting a digital bit stream from a plurality of digital bit streams** (Candelore: Column 15 Line 34 – 35 (e.g., claim 1) & Column 3 Line 51 – 62, Column 6 Line 16 – 22 and Column 4 Line 3 – 16: PID is used by the selective encryption encoder to determine which packets are to be encrypted);

**encrypting a first portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a first encryption method to provide a first encrypted stream** (Candelore: Column 15 Line 43 (e.g., claim 1));

**encrypting a second portion the selected digital bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second**

**encryption method is different from the first encryption method** (Candelore: Column 15 Line 46 (e.g., claim 1));

**multiplexing the first encrypted stream, the second encrypted stream, and the plurality of digital bit streams to provide a partially-encrypted stream** (Candelore: Column 15 Line 48 – 51 (e.g., claim 1); and

**transmitting the partially-encrypted stream** (Candelore: Column 15 Line 52 (e.g., claim 1).

As per claim 2 and 16, Candelore / *Unger* (*incorporated by reference*) teaches a portion of the selected digital bit stream is encrypted, wherein the encrypted portion and an unencrypted portion of the selected digital bit stream are combined with the plurality of digital bit streams (Candelore: Column 15 Line 51 – 52) || (Unger: Table 1 and Figure 6 / E322 & Para [0058] Line 13 – 16).

As per claim 3, 6, 9, 12, 17 and 20, Candelore / *Unger* (*incorporated by reference*) teaches the selected digital bit stream includes a plurality of packets, and wherein each packet includes a packet identifier identifying whether the packet is at least one of a video stream, an audio stream, and a data stream (Candelore: Column 3 Line 51 – 62, Column 6 Line 16 – 22 and Column 4 Line 3 – 16) || (Unger: Table 1, Para [0010] Line 1 – 7, Para [0037] Line 1 – 3 and Para [0047]: there are nine program digital bit stream, as shown in Table 1, constitutes video, audio and auxiliary data packet having a particular packet identifier).

As per claim 4 and 18, Candelore / *Unger* (*incorporated by reference*) teaches the selecting step selects the digital bit stream by identifying a predetermined packet identifier

(Candelore: Column 3 Line 51 – 62, Column 6 Line 16 – 22 and Column 4 Line 3 – 16) ||

(Unger: Para [0010] Line 1 – 7, Para [0037] Line 1 – 3, Para [0055] & Table 1: some implementation, as disclosed by Unger, of partial dual encryption involve duplicating only certain packets tagged with a given packet identifier PID – i.e. the critical packets required for encryption that involves duplicating to achieve dual encryption purpose are chosen only for those packets identified by (i.e. tagged with) a particular packet identifier PID).

As per claim 8 (and claims 5, 10, 11 and 19), Candelore / Unger (*incorporated by reference*) teaches each of the plurality of elementary bit streams includes a plurality of packets, wherein each packet includes a packet header that is indicative of at least one of a video stream, an audio stream, and a data stream (Candelore: Column 3 Line 51 – 62, Column 6 Line 16 – 22 and Column 4 Line 3 – 16) || (Unger: Table 1 and Para [0010] & [0047]: there are nine program digital bit stream, as shown in Table 1, constitutes video, audio and auxiliary data packet having a particular packet identifier).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candelore et al. (U.S. Patent 7,376,233), in view of Vantalon et al. (U.S. Patent 7,216,358).**

As per claim 13 and 14, Candelore does not disclose expressly the first encryption method comprises 3DES and the second encryption method comprises DES.

Vantalon teaches the first encryption method comprises 3DES and the second encryption method comprises DES (Vantalon: Column 8 Line 31 – 37 & Figure 11: a cipher

processor includes a conditional access scrambler / descrambler of DES and 3DES encryption / methods / formats).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Vantalón within the system of Candelore because (a) Candelore teaches enabling conditional access system with more than one encryption / scrambling methods (Candelore: Column 2 Line 3 – 5 / Line 65 – 67 and Column 15 Line 43 – 46), and (b) Vantalón teaches a cipher processor includes a conditional access scrambler / descrambler of DES and 3DES encryption / methods / formats (Vantalón: Column 8 Line 31 – 37 & Figure 11).

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

In the instant appeal brief, Appellant has the presented the following arguments:

#### **Appellants disagree the denial of the beneficial priority date.**

*Examiner notes that the applicability of the prior-art listed in Section (9) Grounds of Rejection is not challenged and the only assertion by Appellants is that Candelore does not qualify as prior art since the claims of the instant application benefit to an earlier priority date.*

The instant claims are not rejected under 112, first paragraph as they were original to the application as filed on 25 June 2003. However, to obtain benefit of the priority date of a parent CON case or a prior provisional application, support for the claimed subject matter must be provided within those applications themselves. Appellants do not make that showing, and merely allege that having the instant application state that it is a CON is sufficient to confer the benefit of the prior date.

Appellant alleged: "Appellants disagree the denial of the beneficial priority date. In addition, since the current application is a continuation along a line of continuations having an effective priority date of July 8, 1998, the effective filing date at least goes back to July 8, 1998 or even can be dated back to the provisional application date of August 1, 1997". *Examiner respectfully disagrees.*

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The arguments presented in the Appeal brief filed 3 August 2009 are responded as follows. Examiner notes the disclosure of the prior-filed application, for example, the immediate parent CON Application No. 09/930,901 filed on 16 August 2001, now US Pat No. 6,937,729 issued 30 August 2005 fails to provide adequate support in the manner required by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application such as " encrypting a first portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a first encryption method to provide a first encrypted stream; encrypting a second portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a second



encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method; " as recited in claim 1.

- The parent CON application now US PAT No. 6,937,729 at column 18, lines 44-59, where the phrase "Any part or all.." is recited at column 18, lines 54-55, fails to disclose the concept of "partial encryption" of the video bitstream as now claimed in the instant application.
- Appellant asserts the disclosures of (a) "any part or all of MPEG transport stream may be encrypted (Brief: Page 5 Line 10 – 12)" (also as per Provisional 60/054,575, Page 28, Line 25 – 26) and (b) "Figure 3 and the above-noted specification portion reveals a digital bit stream (e.g., transport stream) comprising ECM encrypted according to 3DES (e.g., 321) and audio/video/data content coded according to DES (e.g., 327) (Brief: Page 5 Line 4 – 6)" (also as per Provisional 60/054,575, Figure 3) is sufficient to provide Examiner respectfully disagrees because:

Examiner notes, considering "any part or all of MPEG transport stream may be encrypted" (also as per Provisional 60/054,575, Page 28, Line 25 – 26) and "the standard provides for a transport stream (MPEG) that includes a number of component streams and some of these carry content (i.e. video, audio or data), another carries the ECM, and a third carries the EMM and only the streams carrying content are encrypted according to DES; since the control word in ECM and the contents of EMM have already been encrypted, no further encryption is needed when they are sent in the MPEG-2 transport stream" (also as per Provisional 60/054,575,

**Page 13, Line 9 – 14 and Figure 3 & 7)**, this disclosure reveals ECM message as one part of the component of MPEG transport stream has no further encryption needed; however, the ECM bit stream itself is indeed encrypted with 3DES technique (i.e. a content key (control word CW) carried by ECM is encrypted by 3DES as a key-encryption-key protection technique) and audio/video/data content bit stream is encrypted according to DES technique and as such the disclosure has no support as to claim limitation of "encrypting a first portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a first encryption method to provide a first encrypted stream; encrypting a second portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method" as per claim 1 of the instant application.

- Page 13, lines 1-5 of the instant application describes the content stream 329 as one component bit stream and is the only one encrypted according to DES 329. But there is no disclosure here of "a portion" of this content bitstream being encrypted, or as in claim 1, "encrypting a first portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a first encryption method to provide a first encrypted stream; encrypting a second portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method".
- The single phrase "Any part or all of MPEG transport stream may be encrypted" in the parent CON application and/or the provisional application is a description of the well known (at the time of filing the parent CON and prior provisional application) MPEG2 standard where the video (content) bit stream may be encrypted in its entirety.

As disclosed in Figure 7 of provisional 60/054,575 where the TRANSPORT STREAM 701 is the entirety of the bitstreams being multiplexed. The disclosure of "Any part or all..." solely discloses that any component bitstream (or subcategory stream) of MPEG2 transport stream such as the video (content) bit stream (as a component or subcategory bitstream of the whole transport program stream 701, Figure 7) may be encrypted in its entirety or not.

However, the single phrase "any part or all" does not provide one skilled in the art with the understanding that Appellant as of the filing date of the parent CON Application No. 09/930,901 filed on 16 August 2001, now US Pat No. 6,937,729 issued 30 August 2005 and/or provisional application 60/054,575 filed 01 August 1997) had in his possession the invention of partial encryption as described in Candelore, i.e. encryption of only a portion of a video (content) bitstream (or subcategory stream) within a MPEG2 transport stream. Therefore, there is no support of claim limitation (with earlier priority date) such as "encrypting a first portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a first encryption method to provide a first encrypted stream; encrypting a second portion of the selected digital bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method" as recited in the instant claims.

Therefore, the beneficial priority date has been denied since the parent CON application and/or prior provisional application do not support what is being claimed in the instant application.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Longbit Chai/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431

Conferees:

/Christopher A. Revak/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Gilberto Barron Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432